DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 267 SP 005 474

AUTHOR	Masoner, Paul H.
TITLE	An Imperative: A National Policy for Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; International Reading Association, Newark, Del.
PUB DATE	22 Apr 71
NOTE	32p.; Speech presented at the 16th Annual Convention of the International Reading Association, Atlantic City, N. J., April 22, 1971
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036 ($0.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; *Government Role; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

American education is being challenged to play a key role in the improvement of a society threatened simultaneously by domestic crises and by international conflict. A national effort is needed in teacher education to prepare paraprofessionals, teachers, administrators, educational specialists, educational researchers, college teachers of education, and others. Fragmentation is an obstacle, with over 1,000 higher education institutions, 50 state education agencies, hundreds of public and private local school districts, regional and national accrediting agencies, and professional organizations. A national policy for teacher education is needed and should focus on control, finance, social responsibility, partnership roles, program, accreditation, certification, new career patterns, professional competencies, evaluation, technology, accountability, multicultural needs, the urban crisis, international understanding, experimental programs, long-range planning, and educational conference on teacher education; that a broadly representative national policy commission for teacher education be established to develop, scrutinize, and revise policy; and that staff support be provided through a national center for teacher education as a unit of the proposed National Institute of Education. (MBM)

ED 062267

AN IMPERATIVE:
A NATIONAL POLICY FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Paul H. Masoner
University of Pittsburgh

A Distinguished Leader's Address presented at the Sixteenth Annual Convention of the International Reading Association.

Atlantic City April 22, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP005417

Published by

ira INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

AND

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Copies of this publication are available from

International Reading Association
Six Tyre Avenue, Newark, Delaware 19711

or

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY IRA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1972 by the International Reading Association, Inc.
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number *76-184674*

FOREWORD

> Perhaps no other professional field is subject to such a variety of different and often conflicting sources of power and authority — legal, quasi-legal, and extra-legal — as are the education professions and the higher education programs designed to prepare individuals for the education professions.

This statement is taken from an address given by Dr. Paul H. Masoner, President (1970-1971) of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, at the Sixteenth Annual Convention of the International Reading Association, Atlantic City, New Jersey on April 22, 1971.

For a number of years, the International Reading Association has honored distinguished leaders in educational circles by inviting selected scholars to speak to one of the general sessions at the annual convention. The Board of Directors, therefore, honored Dr. Masoner for the dynamic leadership that he has exerted in behalf of education over the past two decades.

Dr. Masoner spoke on the timely theme, "An Imperative: A National Policy for Teacher Education." He clinched his premise that a national policy must emerge by pointing to the fact that the responsibility for teacher education is vested in more than one thousand higher education institutions, fifty state government agencies, hundreds of public and private cooperating local school districts, many business sectors of the nation, a number of regional and national accrediting agencies, many professional organizations — all operating in a relatively independent fashion. Implicit in this scholarly paper is a disquieting fact: if education does not take on this posture it will face increasing criticism and demands.

The author identifies areas of concern which may be taken under advisement and study by a National Policy Commission for Teacher Education and recommends that the initial development of policy by this Commission be preceded by a White House Conference on Teacher Education which would serve to provide the Commission with recommendations relating to policy.

Dr. Masoner suggested that the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education – which numbers in its membership more than 850 universities and colleges – take the leadership in convening a meeting to develop such a Commission and identify guidelines and regulations for its operation. He also included a list of organizations and agencies which should be invited to send representatives to the suggested organizational meeting.

This monograph, which is published cooperatively by IRA and AACTE, represents two professional organizations' concern for the increasing educational problems which have grown out of the apparent and real conflicting sources of power and authority over the preparation of our leaders and teachers in education. Your thoughtful and critical reading of this scholarly and challenging paper is invited. It will be a rewarding experience, hopefully galvanizing you into positive action in support of more unanimity in teacher education and control.

Donald L. Cleland
President
International Reading Association
1970-1971

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director
American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education

The International Reading Association and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education attempt, through publications, to provide a forum for a wide spectrum of opinion on reading. This policy permits divergent viewpoints without assuming the endorsement of the associations.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL POLICY

Teacher education,* the largest professional enterprise in this nation and one of the most fragmented by the very nature of its wide-reaching task, is in need of a clear national policy which will provide guidelines and standards for the many hundreds of governmental units, higher education institutions, organizations, and agencies bearing roles of responsibility for the education professions. The splintering of decision making is considerable. There are almost 1,200 institutions of higher education; 50 state legislatures, state boards of education, and state departments of education; numerous independent or semi-independent boards of professional standards within the states; 6 regional accrediting associations and several accrediting groups at the national level; 50 state education associations affiliated with the National Education Association, and perhaps as many state units of the American Federation of Teachers; and literally dozens of other professional associations and learned societies who have voices in the preparation of personnel for the education professions. Additional input comes from the hundreds of cooperating school systems and thousands of individual schools in which neophyte professionals practice internships. Still further are the indirect but very real influences of private foundations and the nation's business sector. As a final touch to the fragmented picture, both the Congress and the Administration, including the Office of Education, hold power through the funding process.

Amid the reality of such fragmentation is another reality: the heavy criticism of education and of the programs designed to prepare individuals for the education professions. This criticism reflects a larger social discontent. In one educator's words, "At no time in history have the American people faced more disquieting concerns and challenges . . . . The national fabric, woven in olden days for older ways, is being stretched to the point of disintegration" (*2*).

A 1970 report on ***The Education Professions,*** published by the U.S. Office of Education, includes a thoughtful and clear

*Teacher education is used here in its fullest sense to reflect the total scope of workers – teachers, administrators, educational specialists, researchers – who make up the profession. A second term, more definitive and comprehensive, is also used: the preparation of personnel for the education professions. This commonly accepted term originated with the United States Office of Education (USOE).

indictment of preparation programs for the education professions:

> . . . educators who are involved with the poor child know that the real reason that the school has become a trap for so many children stems from the inability of a rigid, essentially middle-class system to meet the needs of this alienated group.
>
> The failure is all pervasive. Teaching is geared to middle-class children despite the socioeconomic level of a school population. Change affecting the classroom takes years to implement because of inflexible operating procedures. Curriculum materials are irrelevant to the life of the poor child. Parents are alienated, for they are aware that the system is cheating their children. The cultural resources of the community are ignored in the educative process. If and when the desperate need for flexibility is finally realized, inadequate financing impedes innovation (*7*).

This failure of the schools and of the education professions is one that stretches across the face of the nation, one that is both urban and rural, one that reaches into the inner city and into the hinterlands of Appalachia, one that touches the black children in the South and in the northern ghetto, the Puerto Rican Americans in Harlem, the Mexican Americans in the southwest, the Indians on the plains reservations.

The alternatives facing the nation during this period of urgency and demand are clearly stated in ***Teachers for the Real World.*** Its authors reject repair of the system as inadequate and ineffectual. They also reject the threatened revolution which would completely remove control of teacher education from those who now hold it. They point to radical reform which would range over ". . . the nature of the schooling process, the systems which control educational policy, and the institutions which prepare persons to be teachers" (*6*).

Thoughtful educators have been concerned that too much responsibility is being placed on the schools and that a single social institution cannot alone overcome the "cumulative impact of abysmal living conditions, shattered family life, or lack of cultural reinforcement" (*7*). While it is true that resolution of the severe social problems of our time must involve multiple efforts, it is just as true that the schools are obligated to play a leading and effective role.

> Despite the persistent defeatism of those who deny that the schools can overcome the environmental

> problems of the poor, there is a growing body of evidence that teachers can and do make a difference in helping the hard-core poverty child to fulfill his potentials in the classroom. The basic truth that the teacher can make school meaningful and important to the poverty child has been known to educators for years. The "helplessness" of the school has become a cliche, one of the many false labels and misconceptions surrounding education in the inner city (*7*).

Although there are the few who reject the present system of public and private education and the higher education programs designed to prepare personnel for the education professions, the great majority of critics and students of education are firmly convinced that the schools of this nation represent the greatest hope for a better world. Both the schools and teacher education programs require – in the words of the authors of ***Teachers for the Real World*** – "radical form" which will make education relevant to present needs.

If we agree that we live in a troubled society, that the schools have a responsible role in alleviating social ills, and that urgent need for radical reform in teacher education exists, then the task is clear and unmistakable.

There is an imperative need for a national policy for teacher education which will give direction in implementing reform within an otherwise fragmented profession. The myriad of organizations affecting preparation of personnel for the education professions operate in relatively independent fashion, without clearly defined policies to serve as guidelines or standards. This lack of national policy is evident in inadequate and poorly conceived financial support, multiple and conflicting approaches to certification and accreditation, laggard efforts for interstate reciprocity, fumbling attacks on problems of urban education, failure to recognize the multicultural responsibilities of the school, hesitancy to accept new career patterns involving professionals and paraprofessionals, and misunderstanding of the role of technology.

Smith and others (*6*) point out the need for a national policy in educating teachers and other professional workers in education:

> To educate teachers to operate in the complex world of today requires programs addressed to national needs. The available manpower is not uniformly distributed through the country nor are the training institutions of high quality equally distributed within the population. Furthermore, teacher training needs have long cut across state and local lines . . . . A national thrust that sees beyond state and local lines is sorely needed.

Universities, both private and public, will be able to serve society more effectively if they take the long-range national view. Should New York City's educational training problems be the exclusive concern of New York universities? Is the problem of training teachers of the disadvantaged one which should preoccupy only those higher education institutions located in disadvantaged areas? Programs with national thrust and responsibilities are needed to move universities, regardless of their support and location, to accept teacher education as a common national problem.

These same writers plead the case for a clear national policy:

> Teacher education is at a critical point in its history. There is now enough knowledge and experience to reform it, to plan a basic program of teacher education for an open society in a time of upheaval. But, if this knowledge and experience are dissipated in prolonged discussions of issues, doctrines, and tenets leading only to ***more*** dialogue, instead of a fundamental program of education for the nation's teachers, teacher education is likely to fragment and its pieces drift in all directions.

Today we see in the fragmentation and uncertainty that beclouds efforts at the reform and improvement of teacher education the very possibility that the writers indicate – a possibility of fruitless and dissipated energies without productive results.

Strong support for this proposal of a national policy is voiced in a recent publication in which Donald P. Cottrell (*3*) points to the need for a ". . . national policy for the improvement of the quality of teacher education." Cottrell, speaking for the National Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, proposes the establishment of a National Teacher Education Foundation responsible for the identification of priorities in teacher education program development and for the development of specific projects for field testing, evaluation, and possible development.*

*Both the Cottrell document, published in August 1970, and this present paper were under preparation simultaneously and independently and both express concern for a national approach to teacher education. However, this paper stresses the initial importance of a comprehensive policy for preparation programs in the education professions, developed through a wide base of representation and kept under constant scrutiny by a "policies commission" as contrasted with the "national foundation" approach by Cottrell. In any case, each complements the other and both press for a recognition of teacher education as a national concern. The writer found Cottrell's analysis and recommendations most useful to the preparation of this paper.

Others have expressed concern for some type of national policy or set of standards that might serve to guide teacher education efforts. President Nixon's proposal to establish a National Institute of Education highlights a wide range of possible efforts to improve education and teacher education. Both the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the National Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges have developed proposals that call for the establishment of a National Center for Teacher Education to assume significant functions in both policy and program development. A Special Studies Commission of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, concluding a two-year study, developed guidelines and recommendations which clearly indicate and emphasize the need for comprehensive national approaches to the improvement of teacher education (*1*).

Daniel P. Moynihan (*4*) provides an extremely clear insight into the results of a setting in which program is determined without adequate statements of policy.

> One of the anomalies of the 1960s is that a period of such extraordinary effort at social improvement should have concluded in a miasma, some would say a maelstrom, of social dissatisfaction.
>
> What went wrong?
>
> Well, countless things went wrong. But I believe one of the more important things is that the structure of American government, and the pragmatic tradition of American politics, too much defined public policy in forms of ***programs,*** and in consequence has inhibited the development of true ***policy.*** In simpler times a simple programmatic approach was an efficient way to go about the public business. The problem comes with complexity. More specifically, the problem comes when society becomes ambitious and seeks to bring about significant changes in the operation of complex systems such as the society itself. There is nothing the least wrong with such ambitions. What is wrong is a pattern in which the ambitions are repeatedly proclaimed, and just as frequently frustrated – especially when the source of the frustration lies not in the malfeasance of individuals but in the limitations of the ***program*** approach to issues which demand the disciplined formulations and elaborations of public ***policy*** (*4*).

While Moynihan is talking about public policy as related to actions by the federal government, his observations are just as

true when applied to public policy involved in a matter as critical to society as the preparation of personnel for the education professions. Far too many decisions relating to this most important area of professional preparation have been made on an ad hoc basis, often without reference to the experience of others, often without knowledge of the evidence of careful research, and almost always without any consideration of basic policy since none that could be truly called ***public policy*** really exists.

WHAT SHOULD BE ITS NATURE AND ROLE?

If the development of a national policy for teacher education is an imperative, then the nature of its elements must be clearly identified.

Policy must be broad and comprehensive and must deal with essential issues relating to teacher education rather than to the many individual tasks and problems that relate to teacher education. As Moynihan (*4*) has pointed out:

> As increasingly we begin to understand the social system as just that, a system, it is possible, and for many purposes necessary, to be meticulous about classifying various forms of system intervention . . . . Programs relate to a single part of the system; policy seeks to respond to the system in its entirety.

If we view teacher education as a major element in our total social system, then it is clear that teacher education policy must relate first of all to major social policy that might be regarded as national goals and must be consistent with these goals. Further, teacher education policy must be based on "sensitive insight into the nature of problems and on rigorous analysis of alternative solutions" (*4*).

In the recent annual report of the National Advisory Council of Education Professions Development there is strong concern expressed for the necessity of policy development relating to the support of the education professions by the national government, and the elements of effective policy are clearly enunciated. The report points out that policies should include objectives, strategies, priorities, evaluation of the program, and the need for diversity. Further, the report states, there are certain attributes which characterize well-formulated policies. Among these are a clear delineation of the problems to which a given effort is designed to respond; a fully developed rationale; evidence of system thinking; specification of the target population to be affected; a clear statement of the nature, quality, and quantity of the yield expected from the effort — and over what time span; the degree of planned variation; the nature of coordination with other programs; alternative courses of action considered and why rejected; conditions for the success of the effort and possible adverse consequences from the effort (*5*).

While this report was prepared in response to specific concerns relating to the need for federal government policy, it is equally cogent and useful in our own broad and comprehensive social concern for the education of all those who constitute the education professions. It clearly indicates the nature of national policy that must be developed in the realm of teacher education.

Although later in this paper there is a detailed description of the method by which it is suggested that national policy be established, it seems important at this point to interject a brief description of the process. It is recommended that a National Policy Commission on Teacher Education be established through the joint participation and action of major associations of institutions of higher education, national professional and learned societies, federal and state governments, regional and national accrediting associations, and other organizations concerned with the role of education and educational institutions. The National Policy Commission, composed of individuals of recognized competence and leadership, will not only assume the responsibility for the development of an initial policy statement but will develop policy statements on specific issues or matters of major concern and further will regularly review and revise policy to meet the needs of a changing society.

A further consideration relating to the development of national policy in regard to preparation for the education professions deals with the role and authority of policy once determined. What should be the stance of both the executive and legislative branches of federal and state governments in respect to policy statements dealing with such a vital issue as the preparation of teachers and other professional workers for our educational institutions? How should such policy be viewed by the profession itself? How should the schools and the public they represent – the recipients of educational services – react to national policy? And how should the institutions of higher education with their long tradition of independence and autonomy utilize national policy in their deliberations and decisions concerning professional education?

National policy which has been developed from the study, deliberation, and decision of a national policy commission should carry considerable authority and acceptance on the part of educational institutions and organizations, governmental bodies, the profession, and the public. However, it is not suggested here that there be any power and authority to national policy except that which grows out of the prestige and recognition of those who have formulated it and of the logic and soundness of the policy itself. Further, it is believed that

national policy, once developed on a sound and positive basis with the authority of recognized leadership, will fill an existent void created by the absence of any clear and complete statement of policy. Certainly, the profession, school systems, institutions of higher education, and governmental bodies will look to such policy for guidance, assistance, and support. In fact, it would appear likely that the public, in the absence of a willingness and desire to consider national policy in decision making on the part of institutions and individuals, would bring to bear the weight of opinion that would insist upon affirmative action in regard to national policy.

A further matter of concern are those matters which properly might be the subject of policy statements. National policy for teacher education must provide support for major national goals. It must deal with broad and overriding concerns. It must grow out of a clear knowledge of the task of education and the problems to be encountered. It must have considered possible alternatives. It must be concerned with the long range as well as the immediate. It must include a clear indication of priorities of national need. If we accept these statements, then it is certain that national policy can deal with a significant variety of matters related to teacher education. It must further deal with major concerns, but particular circumstances may require that policy deal with subunits of major concerns. National policy cannot be static; it must be constantly reviewed and revised in terms of the social setting and the needs of society.

In the following paragraphs are discussions of a selected number of matters which might well be the subject of national policy – matters dealing with such vital topics as control, finance, social responsibility, partnership roles, and program. These are by no means a complete list but are to be regarded merely as examples of matters for policy consideration. In discussing these examples, I have not presumed to indicate what policy should be but have raised questions on and comments about the possible concerns that a commission might consider in formulating a policy.

Control

Perhaps no other professional field is subject to such a variety of different and often conflicting sources of power and authority – legal, quasi-legal, and extralegal – as are the education professions and the higher education programs designed to prepare individuals for the education professions. The locus of authority rests in such legally constituted bodies as state legislatures, state boards of education, state departments of

education, professional standards boards, certification and licensing offices, and other organizations with legally delegated authority. At the same time the federal government, primarily through regulations and guidelines relating to funding arrangements to states and to individual higher education institutions, exerts effective controls. Added to these are national and regional accrediting associations and professional organizations, all of which exercise effective and salutary extralegal authority in matters relating to preparation for the education professions. And, with relatively little exception, this multiplicity of regulatory activities occurs with no coordination or unity in terms of clearly stated goals and concepts. What is amazing, perhaps, is the fact that total chaos does not exist.

A number of issues and questions clearly emerge as vital considerations in the development of policy. What are the respective roles of the National Commission on Accrediting, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the regional accrediting associations? How should these roles be constituted and what should be the parameters of their authority? How do professional associations such as the National Education Association and its satellite organization, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, or the American Federation of Teachers, or the state affiliates of both these associations, exercise appropriate roles of authority and control of professional education?

At the same time similar questions must be raised concerning the role of state governments in both the executive and legislative branches. At this level authority is exercised in respect to both accreditation (or approval) of institutions to prepare professionals for education as well as the certification or licensing of a broad range of career fields from teaching to administration. How should both types of control be most effectively handled? What are the merits and demerits of the legislative approach to specific regulations written into law to govern both accreditation and licensing as contrasted with a delegation of regulatory power to state departments or boards of education? What should be the bases for reciprocity agreements in certification between or among states?

Additional questions must be raised in terms of federal government activities that impinge on professional education. Direct grants to states, both current and contemplated, invariably exercise direct or indirect controls of various kinds. Equally obvious as a source of control are grants to support teacher education programs, for such grants and the conditions of funding reflect a point of view of the U.S. Office of Education, the executive branch generally, and/or the Congress. Often, the

well-known "site visit" to determine eligibility for a grant is a thinly disguised accreditation visit. And, in the past year, the USOE has made tentative moves in the direction of establishing an outright accreditation program which presumably would operate unilaterally with its own standards, without direct coordination with present accreditation bodies.

Added to all of this is the independence of institutions of higher education, the tradition of academic freedom, and the concept of the institution as a seeker of truth without restriction or infringement by legal or extralegal bodies. One must ask to what extent these overlapping and often conflicting jurisdictions have hindered past development and will continue to hinder future development of high quality models of professional education.

Policy on governance of professional programs for the education professions has always been needed. Today it is urgent. Already lines of battle are being drawn by organizations claiming to have the inherent right to govern professional study and its accoutrements of accreditation and certification. A struggle for power, undisciplined and pervasive, can only be deleterious. With clear and authoritative national policy, however, guidelines can clarify the respective roles of public and private agencies, institutions of higher education, and education professions personnel. Guidelines will permit and encourage participation in governance by everyone having a vital stake in the education professions. Such unity of purpose, concept, and action can make possible the mobilization of strength to improve professional education rather than the divisiveness of conflict that can bring about irreparable harm.

Finance

Although the preparation of personnel for the education professions is quite clearly an educational function that directly undertakes the performance of a legal public responsibility – the education of all youth and adults – there is yet to be developed any set of accepted standards that might serve as guiding principles for the financial support of this immense educational task.

In fact, any review of financial support programs points to the lack of uniform policy and practice. In the fifty states, each of which has a constitutional obligation to provide education for its youth (and thus indirectly might be assumed to have a responsibility in regard to the preparation of teachers and other personnel needed for the public schools), financial support

practices are at best uncoordinated and haphazard in terms of acceptance of teacher education as a responsibility of the state. Support, if any, for teacher education is provided only as a part of support of higher education and of students involved in higher education institutions.

A few states have recognized the importance of the clinical experience (student teaching) and provide certain direct grants for this aspect of the program either to the higher education institution or to the school district involved. In some instances local school districts, serving as partners in the teacher education program, make substantial contributions of dollars and/or services. However, both practices are the exception and not the rule.

At the federal level, one might anticipate that there would be clear policy relating to the support of programs in the education professions. Yet, such is not the case. Financial support is provided through a number of independent and uncoordinated sources, ranging from USOE to NSF to OEO and to many others. Even within a single funding agency coordination of policy is not assured. The very immensity of federal agencies involved in funding tends to result in a number of small bureaucracies within a single agency, each with its policy (or lack of policy, as the case may be), determined often by a single individual who directs a single sphere of activity. Support in some cases, as in the field of vocational education, has a long history and has a degree of permanence. In other cases, support programs are relatively new and may change from year to year with little assurance of continuity. In the majority of instances support for the preparation of personnel for the education professions cannot be viewed as general support, but rather as categorical support based upon a kind of competitive approach that often is viewed as resulting in a situation where the "rich become richer and the poor become poorer."

In the final analysis – with the possible exception of teacher education programs in higher education institutions owned and operated by government, usually at state level – relatively little is available in public funds for the general support of teacher education. Consequently, tuition, endowment income, and contributions from private sources presently carry the lion's share of the cost for preparing personnel to perform a legal responsibility of the fifty states and of the federal government. But most critical is the fact that all support, whatever the source, is inadequate to perform the task adequately and that the varying levels of support from state to state and from institution to institution are such that wide ranges of quality in programs are inevitable.

If we hold to the view that one of the most important tasks of society is the education of children, youth, and adults, then we must agree that the preparation of personnel for this task must be financially supported in a manner that will assure sufficient numbers of professional staff, provide quality levels on a national basis, offer opportunity for the experimental development of new approaches to professional education, and guarantee continuity to existing or new programs of quality.

Policy that will result in such outcomes must be developed on the basis of a careful scrutiny of the financial needs of teacher education and a determination of the responsibility of society for teacher education. A number of questions arise. Does government, state and federal, have a special financial role to play in the preparation of personnel for the education professions as contrasted with other professional fields? Should special support be provided for the growing involvement of the schools themselves as partners in the preparation of teachers and other professionals? What are minimum levels of support needed to assure quality of professional education? Should not teacher education receive support comparable to that provided for medical education in many states? What should be the role of the states in providing financial support for the education of teachers apart from their support of public higher education institutions? Do local school districts, recipients as they are of the results of teacher education programs, have a responsibility to share in the costs as well as the benefits of teacher education?

At the federal level, many other questions arise. What is the basic role of federal support in teacher education? Should support be primarily designed to encourage new and improved approaches to professional education? Should support be categorical or general? Should support be made available on a revenue-sharing basis with the states? How can the vast and uncoordinated efforts of the federal government be brought together under the guidelines of clear and carefully developed policy?

Whatever the content of policy might be, it does appear clear that the task of preparing personnel for the education professions is too important to be dangling on the threads of weak and uncertain financial support. A clear enunciation of policy is needed to offer to federal, state, and local governments, as well as to institutions of higher education, guidelines that will serve the long range development of high quality professional education.

Partnership Roles

Thoughtful members of the education professions, both those who are teacher educators and those who are practitioners, are more and more coming to recognize the fact that the task of preparing members of the education professions must utilize the combined resources of a variety of institutions and agencies in addition to the colleges and universities traditionally held responsible for professional education.

If there is to be adequate use of resources, teacher education must be viewed as a partnership task rather than as a unilateral undertaking by institutions of higher education. In spite of the logic behind such a concept, it is remarkable that relatively few teacher education programs reflect a total commitment to the idea. True, most institutions have some type of cooperative efforts in student teaching and internship activities. Even these, however, do not bear the hallmarks of a real partnership which envisages the joint efforts of two or more partners, each with an equal opportunity to provide input to the process. Any meaningful partnership goes far beyond the usual relationship that exists between school systems and institutions of higher education in efforts to provide prospective teachers and other professionals with practicum experiences as an aspect of their professional preparation. Since there is a growing belief that it is vitally important that the total resources of the community be available to programs of professional preparation and that all organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals with a stake in and a concern for professional quality be involved, it would appear that policy on a national level would be most important in developing ideas, concepts, and programs based on the partnership approach.

Initial partnership concerns are apparent in the institution of higher education itself. Few responsible and thoughtful individuals are willing to relegate the total task and responsibility for professional education to the department or school or college of education. Nor are professional teacher educators themselves willing to accept such a sole responsibility. Most educational leaders clearly recognize the need for clarification of the roles of the faculties of arts and sciences, schools of education, and other professional fields of study which can contribute to preparation for various education careers. What then are the responsibilities of professional faculties of education, of arts and sciences, and others? It is a question which demands a clear answer.

A sound and logical area of concern in the development of partnership approaches relates to the role of both public and private schools in the preparation of teachers. What portion and

what aspects of preparation for careers in education belong with the schools themselves? Contemporary thinking goes far beyond the idea that practicum arrangements such as student teaching and internships are sufficient. Should schools play a role in determining the nature of the curriculum and the recruitment and selection of prospective members of the professions? What role should they play in the evaluation of those involved as students and in these students' entry into the profession?

Related to, but separate from the public and private schools is the role of the profession itself. Members of the profession through the state education associations, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers as well as through a variety of other professional and learned organizations and societies are seeking appropriate roles in the area of professional education and in the admission of individuals to the profession. Professional standards boards manned almost exclusively by members of the profession are appearing on the horizon and are beginning to effect significant changes in professional education. The National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, along with its state counterparts, has major concern for professional study. These voices are not to be ignored nor denied. In fact, most professional educators are ready to agree that all of these, as representatives of the profession itself, should have certain vital rights as partners in the teacher education enterprise. But, no one has yet provided appropriate answers that delineate clearly the partnership role.

Neither can we ignore the legal responsibility of state and national governments to assume certain power and authority. State governments, through executive and legislative branches, and particularly through state boards of education and state departments of education, have a clear responsibility coupled with legal authority. At the same time, the federal government (with no constitutional power to control professional teacher education in all its aspects) exerts considerable power through financial contributions to states, school systems, and teacher education institutions. What should be the partnership role of state government in teacher education? To what extent should the federal government be a partner and under what conditions?

A few years ago our discussion of the several partners in teacher education might have ended at this point. A new social order now demands that two other vitally interested groups – the students and the community – be involved and that their partnership rights and responsibilities be clearly defined. Although opinion is divided on the matter, leading education thinkers as well as thoughtful citizens have come to clearly

recognize that the community, comprised of the consumers of the education process, has not only a vital concern but an active role to play. Equally, the students, as those persons immediately involved in programs of professional study, have concerns which must be recognized and weighed.

Program

Few fields of professional study are as beset with such diversity of different curricular patterns as the education professions. Whether the preparation is for teaching, administration, supervision, counseling, or any other specialized career field in education, the variety is obvious. Added to this diversity must be the many proposals for new approaches to professional study — some coming from careful and thoughtful scholars and practitioners and others coming from the professional critics of education who find it especially profitable to place the blame for many of the nation's problems on education and particularly on the institutions of higher education and their teacher education programs. Diversity in professional study is not in itself bad nor should criticism per se be stifled. Both assure any field of professional study the necessary dynamic and viable qualities necessary in fulfilling its mission.

On the other hand, the question must be asked whether the diversity in programs has resulted from clear and carefully planned policy or whether it comes from other conditions: lack of commitment to teacher education, inadequate or ill-prepared professional leadership, insufficient finances for a satisfactory program, failure of state departments of education to develop appropriate guidelines for program approval and for certification, unwillingness of local school systems to cooperate in the teacher education program. To this list might be added a host of other factors, all of which could be contributing to diversity or leading to criticism and none of which might be in any way related to rational planning for diverse approaches to the preparation of professional educators. In fact, I believe that most students of professional study in education would agree that diversity in professional education, while obviously important and necessary if we are to continue to explore new approaches and evaluate them carefully, has in the past largely been an accidental and haphazard kind of diversity with relatively little relationship to planned policy.

The scope of policy decisions in the area of professional study is indeed considerable. Guidelines must deal not only with both academic and professional components of the curriculum, but with an entire range of career fields from teaching to administration. Further, in a dynamic and demanding society,

policy must be concerned with emerging new career patterns needed for the years and decades ahead if education really will serve societal needs. Policy relating to professional study must always avoid even the hint of rigidity and restriction. While policy may indeed be useful to prevent useless and haphazard diversity in teacher education, at the same time it must preserve the right that every field of professional study requires – the opportunity to experiment and explore new and better approaches to preparation of individuals for professional service.

This means, then, that policy in this instance should provide useful guidelines based on the best professional knowledge available for the development of professional programs of quality and for the continual improvement of professional study.

Clearly, policy must be concerned with the basic question of balance between academic and professional study. Moreover, policy must look at the much debated and still unclear field of general education. What kind of and how much general education is needed for teachers and for other professionals? What specific role should the social and behavioral sciences play in preparing professional educators? What should be the content of the teaching field or fields and the cognates?

Apart from academic and professional subject matter content are the questions relating to practicum experiences – student teaching, internships, and residencies. Much current professional thought reflects increasing attention toward various types of practicums and suggests that much of the preparation of the professional, whether teacher, educational specialist, or administrator, should be based in the school and the community rather than on the campus.

Still other questions deal with individualization of learning. If we agree that the emphasis on learning in elementary and secondary schools and even in colleges and universities should provide for individualization, then we must ask how effectively the preparation of teachers provides for this emphasis. How should the curriculum prepare teachers who will help children to learn in individualized settings? How should the program for preparing administrators and educational specialists equip them to give leadership to individualized learning?

At a time when societal changes are influencing the roles of education and of the schools – even demanding the development of new career patterns and of differentiated staffing, seeking a redefinition of the roles of the education professions – those responsible for the preparation of professionals need to

look to clear statements of policy for guidelines in continued program development. Many institutions of higher education, four year institutions as well as community colleges, need guidance in developing clearly defined career fields at the paraprofessional and professional levels. The fifty state departments of education and their certification arms reveal (through often inept approaches) the need for coherent and coordinated approaches to career pattern development.

Another area in which policy statements should be important is the emerging concept of performance-based criteria, a concept which may well bring about significant and far-reaching changes in patterns of career development programs not only in teacher education but in all professions. Of similar promise is the role of the new technology in preparing individuals for the profession. It requires clear definition for the guidance of the thousands of individuals in higher education institutions, public schools, education agencies, and other organizations and institutions concerned with the preparation of education personnel. What role will television, videotape equipment, computers, student response equipment, films, slides, audio recordings, and other adaptations of modern technology play? How can microteaching aid in the preparation of individuals for the real classroom? Can television enable the master teacher to reach more individuals effectively?

Policy should concern itself with the entire matter of continuing education for professional educators. How viable is the present approach that deals largely with accumulation of graduate credits? What relationship should exist between job needs and community needs and the nature of the continuing education program? Are advanced degrees the answer or should all individuals enter the profession after the completion of a master's degree and place later emphasis on continuing education in the school system or in a consortium of school systems organized on the basis of educational needs, reserving advanced graduate study for specialization fields? These are questions which the profession must answer.

Specific attention in policy formulation should focus on the matter of the length of the period of professional study. Currently we see four-year, five-year, and even six-year programs for the preparation of teachers. At the level of specialized professional fields such as administration, research, counseling, and supervision, we see equally varied approaches in terms of the extent and length of the program required to achieve what is termed professional competence. Recently the Carnegie Commission revived the question of the length of the undergraduate program, suggesting that it may well be possible to achieve what

is needed in three rather than four years. Similar questions have for years been raised about graduate study and have been critical of the master's programs that extend to as many as two years and the doctoral programs that frequently require six, eight, or ten years for completion.

Policy makers might focus less on time-serving concepts and more on the matter of competence. It is not inconceivable that much more might be done at the undergraduate level in three years than is done now. All prospective teachers might spend some period of graduate study in preparation for entry into the profession. Attention should be given to competence-based approaches in the various present graduate level programs for the preparation of administrators and other education specialists. Policy planning must direct its efforts toward the development of programs of preparation based on competence-based or performance-based approaches that offer a higher level of professional competence than is now true.

Social Responsibility

As a social responsibility education must respond to the issues, problems, and needs of its society. In line with this responsibility, the preparation of teachers and other professional workers in education must be designed so that those who work in our schools, colleges, universities, and other educational agencies and institutions are responsive to the needs and demands of a changing social order. While few will quarrel with this point of view, relatively little has been done to develop policy or guidelines to meet this responsibility.

For example, educational institutions are currently floundering in their efforts to prepare professional educators for the problems of an urban society, the issues of social and racial injustice, or the urgency of developing international understanding. While policy statements relating to the role of the education professions in meeting social needs certainly cannot be expected to solve all the problems, they can help institutions determine the appropriate role of professional study with respect to urgent social problems and issues and in establishing basic program approaches to professional preparation designed to aid educators in their efforts to ameliorate social ills.

Central among the social concerns which should be dealt with in policy formulation is the multicultural nature of our society and the need for a breed of professional educators prepared to provide programs recognizing our pluralistic culture and at the same time, building upon cultural strengths in

providing educational opportunities for every child, youth, and adult. Our schools have failed dismally in providing adequate education for blacks, Puerto Rican-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Indians. Further failure is apparent in inner city poverty areas and in rural Appalachia where poor white populations suffer under similar educational handicaps. It is not merely a question of goodwill. There is a need for a policy which will offer guidelines to educational institutions, school systems, departments of education, and others who are professionally obligated to offer quality education to all children and adults.

Overlapping the problems of our multicultural society are the problems of urbanization and metropolitanism. Demographers declare that, in the near future, the American population will be concentrated in a limited number of strip cities, some of them hundreds of miles long. Even now – before such cities actually exist – we see major problems stemming from the high concentration of population. It is a fact borne out by recent United States census findings that persons from the higher economic levels are deserting the inner city, leaving behind less fortunate minority group members to live in poverty and despair. As the suburbs have become centers of relative affluence and better educational programs, they have also assumed the tones of intolerance, bigotry, and racism. Education must assume a key role in demanding that quality personnel be prepared for both inner city and suburban schools and in bringing about equality of educational opportunity.

The growing concern over serious environmental damage through pollution of water, air, and soil has posed another urgent social problem to which the schools and all educational personnel must address themselves. Once again, lack of guidelines and policy threatens a laggard effort, and lack of program coordination in teacher education hampers an effective response. Questions inevitably arise over the role of the schools and the necessary preparation for teachers and others who must assume leadership responsibility in combating environmental dangers that can result in the virtual destruction of the human race.

Important not only to our own nation but to the world is the role of education in developing international understanding. Once again, most will agree that this is clearly a task of education along with other social institutions and agencies. Too little has been accomplished in the past toward developing true international understanding through education. While the mere existence of a policy statement will not be a panacea, nevertheless some unequivocal statement of national policy coupled with practical guidelines would be a significant step in the direction of

developing an education profession and a system dedicated to the task of developing international understanding.

Another question needs to be raised concerning the nature of policy in relation to social needs. What is the role of education in bringing about social change? There is disagreement on this matter. Some believe that the schools should always follow society. Others believe that the schools, as social institutions, should play a clear and decisive role in helping to bring about desirable change. This is an area in which uncertainty and lack of clarity require policy statements which will at least offer direction to teacher education as the profession seeks to develop programs designed to meet the needs of a dynamic social order.

The matters just discussed as possible subjects of national policy are by no means complete. Many other concerns might well be the object of careful study and consideration. Some of these represent broad topics similar to those already discussed. Others represent what might be subunits of broad and comprehensive policy areas but nevertheless critical and important in terms of policy formulation. A partial list of topics in both categories might include such matters as accountability, evaluation, manpower needs, experimental programs, accreditation, certification or licensing, reciprocity among states, long range planning. In any case, once policy development is undertaken as a national concern on a continuing basis, those concerns which should be the subject of policy formulation are quite likely to emerge clearly.

WHAT PROCESS FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT?

If it is clear that a national policy for teacher education is essential to the effectiveness of education and our educational institutions, then it should be equally clear that the process for development of national policy is a concern of critical importance. Therefore, it is recommended that the development of national policy be the responsibility of a National Policy Commission for Teacher Education. It is further recommended that the initial development of policy by this commission be preceded by a White House Conference on Teacher Education which shall serve to provide the commission with basic policy concerns and recommendations growing out of the deliberations of the conference participants.

The quality of any statement of national policy and its acceptance by the Congress and the fifty state legislatures, the executive branches of national and state governments, accrediting associations, professional and learned societies and organizations, higher education institutions, and the public is closely related to the nature of the membership of the commission and the representativeness of that membership. Thus, it is essential that those who are members of the commission be individuals who have a high level of social concern and who have demonstrated in their own lives a thoughtful consideration of the nature of professional programs for the preparation of educational leadership. It is equally essential that the membership be representative of the broad spectrum of society concerned with the education professions – higher education, state and national governments, accrediting bodies, the profession itself, and the public. Any lack of representativeness would lessen the commission's effectiveness and would raise questions concerning the validity and appropriateness of policy.

In order to initiate the proposed National Policy Commission, it is suggested that the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education – an association numbering in its membership more than 850 universities and colleges preparing annually approximately 95 percent of teachers, educational specialists, administrators, college and university education faculties, and other professional personnel in education – convene a meeting to develop a plan for the organization of the National Policy Commission, establishing guidelines and regulations for its operation, setting up controls for the continuing nomination and election of members, and arranging for financing the commission's activities.

Possible organizations and agencies which should be invited to participate in this meeting for the establishment of the National Policy Commission are:

Organizations of Institutions

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Council on Education
American Association of Colleges
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

Professional Groups

Associated Organizations for Teacher Education
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association
National Catholic Education Association
American Federation of Teachers

Accrediting Groups

National Council on Accrediting
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
Regional Accrediting Associations

States

Education Commission of the States
National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification

National Government

United States Office of Education
The Congress

Others

National School Boards Association

This assembly of individuals representing major organizations, agencies, and institutions concerned with the preparation of personnel for the education professions, once convened, shall have as its major responsibility the development of a document establishing the National Policy Commission for Teacher Education. Among the items to be included in the establishing document are 1) the purposes and responsibilities of the commission; 2) the membership, including such items as representation, method of selection, terms, and rotation policy; 3) organization and structure; 4) officers; 5) professional staffing; and 6) financial support.

It should be assumed that commission members, while they will be representing various organizations, associations, and agencies, will not necessarily represent any official line. They will be expected to function as individuals seeking sound policy in terms of their own professional judgments.

In performing its task, the commission will need professional staff assistance. The staff will be responsible for gathering information already available in the literature of the education professions, obtaining current research information from the ERIC Center on Teacher Education and other ERIC centers, communicating directly with federally supported research and development centers and regional laboratories for new and relevant research data and development projects, initiating additional research as needed, and researching and writing policy statements at the commission's direction.

This staff may be an independent unit attached to the commission and supported directly by federal grants or it may be a unit of the proposed National Institute of Education or of the National Institute for Higher Education. A recently proposed National Center for Teacher Education, endorsed and recommended by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, which might be located in either of the national institutes, might be a most appropriate location. Nevertheless, it is imperative that the support staff operate with complete independence of federal agencies, the USOE or the HEW, and the proposed national institutes. Its direct and sole responsibility would be to the National Policy Commission. Only through such independence could the commission develop policy that represents the view of the members in terms of their sound judgments.

Earlier in this paper it was suggested that the organization and operation of the commission be preceded by a White House Conference on Teacher Education. Such a conference, called by the President and supported by federal funds, could provide a broad based approach to issues relating to preparation for the education professions and develop tentative policy statements for study and consideration by the commission preparatory to the development of an initial policy statement.

The Associated Organizations for Teacher Education (AOTE), an organization of societies and associations largely concerned with the preparation of personnel for the education professions, has already initiated efforts related to such a

conference. Representing as it does a large number of organizations with a combined individual membership of more than 200,000 together with AACTE and its 850 university and college members, AOTE would be an appropriate organization to provide leadership for the conference.

Because of the critical importance of such a conference – the first in the history of American education – and because of its long term implications, it is recommended that in addition to the usual appropriation for a White House Conference, a substantial amount be provided through USOE funds for support of preliminary research, studies, and published material useful to participants. Such an allocation of funds might most appropriately be made to the AACTE which could then tap the considerable resources of its member institutions to engage in study basic to the success of a conference developed to provide guidelines for the National Policy Commission.

To be of optimal value in terms of process and product, the White House Conference should follow past patterns of preliminary conferences at local and regional levels for maximum participation by educators, academicians, professionals, and the public. Thus, policy that eventually might be developed by the National Commission would most certainly be in part the product of extensive national involvement and would be most likely to gain major support from all quarters.

It must be emphasized that policy developed by the National Policy Commission would not be mandatory for education institutions, state or federal governments, or any group or individual. Nevertheless, such policy – carefully developed and under continuous review and carrying with it the authority and prestige of a commission of acknowledged quality – would directly and indirectly affect decisions relating to the education professions. Institutions of higher education should benefit from its guidance and support in the improvement of programs of professional education. State governments should gain from the significant guidelines for developing educational standards, determining certification and licensing requirements, and financing education. The federal government – including Congress, the President, HEW, and other executive branches concerned with education – could receive guidance in bringing order out of chaotic, overlapping, and even contradictory programs of support and development of the education professions. The policy's impact on public opinion could conceivably be such that recalcitrant legislative and government agencies disregarding educational policy might be brought to comply by pressure of public and political

opinion. While not a panacea for the ills of society or its educational institutions, a sound policy reflecting vital needs can provide guidelines, molding the fragments into a responsible and responsive profession whose task of educating personnel for the nation's schools is formidable.

30

SUMMARY

American education is being challenged to play a key role in the improvement of a society threatened simultaneously by domestic crises and by international conflict. Critical to the ability of educational institutions to meet this new and urgent challenge is a national effort in teacher education which will prepare in adequate numbers and at a high level of quality the broad spectrum of educational workers – paraprofessionals, teachers, administrators, educational specialists, educational researchers, college teachers of education, and others – for the total educational system from kindergarten through college and university.

Fragmentation is an obstacle. Responsibility for teacher education rests in over a thousand higher education institutions, fifty state government education agencies, hundreds of public and private cooperating local school districts, the business sector of the nation, a number of regional and national accrediting agencies, numerous professional organizations – all operating in a relatively independent fashion with no clearly-defined policies to coordinate this vast professional enterprise and to point the way to a level of quality equal to the task assigned by society to the schools.

An imperative need exists for the development of a national policy for teacher education. The policy must merit the confidence of the public and serve as a guide to federal, state, and local agencies; nongovernmental organizations and agencies; professional organizations and associations; colleges and universities; and others who make decisions concerning teacher education. Policy development should focus upon such matters as control, finance, social responsibility, partnership roles, program, accreditation, certification, new career patterns, professional competences, evaluation, technology, accountability, multicultural needs, the urban crisis, international understanding, experimental programs, and long range planning and educational forecasting.

It is recommended that initial steps for the development of a national policy be taken at a White House Conference on Teacher Education; that a broadly representative National Policy Commission for Teacher Education, similar to the earlier Educational Policies Commission, be established to develop, constantly scrutinize, and revise policy; and that staff support for such an effort be provided through a National Center for Teacher Education as a unit of the National Institute of Education proposed by President Richard Nixon in March 1970.

REFERENCES

1. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. ***Crises in Teacher Education.*** Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1971, 17.

2. Burdin, Joel. ***Progress and Prospects: The State of the Association.*** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969, 25.

3. Cottrell, Donald P. ***National Policy for the Improvement of the Quality of Teacher Education.*** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970, 34.

4. Moynihan, Daniel P. "Policy vs. Program in the 70s," ***The Public Interest,*** 20 (Summer 1970), 90-100.

5. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. ***Windows to the Bureaucracy.*** Washington, D.C.: Annual Report of the Council, 1971.

6. Smith, B. Othanel. ***Teachers for the Real World.*** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969, 185.

7. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Office of Education). ***The Education Professions, 1969-1970.*** Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970, 84.